



TERMINAL INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES (TERPS) WORKING GROUP

TWG

Aug 8-9, 2001

STATUS

TWG Control # 01-02-017

Subject: Initial Approach Based on High Altitude Teardrop Penetration (TERPS, paragraph 235).

Background/Discussion: FAAO 8260.3B, paragraph 235, Initial Approach Based on High Altitude Teardrop Penetration, does not state whether a different NAVAID can be used to define the Intermediate/Final Approach segment. Paragraph 236 addresses a "course reversal using non-collocated facilities." The differences between paragraphs 235 and 236 is that with paragraph 235 you are returning and over-heading the same NAVAID you use for the outbound course (See FAAO 8260.3B, Figures 7 & 8). Using paragraph 236 you are going outbound using 1 NAVAID (never coming back to or crossing over it) and on the inbound portion you are switching to a second, non-collocated, NAVAID (See FAAO 8260.3B, Figures 9-1, 9-2, and 9-3). A situation could occur where the NAVAID used for the teardrop is located on a MLS/ILS course, thus the entire teardrop course would be utilizing one NAVAID and once crossing back over that NAVAID, transition to a different NAVAID providing Final Approach guidance.

Recommendations: Add a sentence to paragraph 235 that states: "The NAVAID used for course guidance will usually be the same NAVAID that provides final Approach guidance. Additionally, if the NAVAID used for teardrop course guidance is located on the MLS/ILS final approach course, you may use this criteria in conjunction with MLS/ILS criteria. See paragraph 242a for intermediate course alignment limitations."

Submitted by:

Tom Schneider

Organization:

Air Force Flight Standards Agency

Phone:

240-857-6701

E-mail:

thomas.schneider@andrews.af.mil

Date:

12 July 2001

TWG 01-02: Tom Schneider, AFFSA, introduced this recommendation for discussion. The USAF TERPS automation programmers were having problems defining all the nuances of high-altitude teardrop design criteria. After review and group discussion, it was agreed that the criteria, as written is satisfactory. All were in agreement that the former TERPS Automation Working Group (TAWG) should be re-activated to address this type issue. Jack Corman, AFS-420, agreed to initiate efforts to have the TAWG reformed – see paragraph 5c of the minutes of TWG 01-02 for additional comments regarding the TAWG. **Recommendation Closed.**
